United Nations S/PV.3449

Security Council
Forty-ninth Year

Provisional

3449th Meeting
Friday, 4 November 1994, 12.45 p.m.
New York

President:	Mrs. Albright	(United States of America)
Members:	Argentina	Mr. Cárdenas
	Brazil	Mr. Sardenberg
	China	Mr. Li Zhaoxing
	Czech Republic	Mr. Kovanda
	Djibouti	Mr. Dorani
	France	Mr. Mérimée
	New Zealand	Mr. Keating
	Nigeria	Mr. Ayewah
	Oman	Mr. Al-Khussaiby
	Pakistan	Mr. Marker
	Russian Federation	Mr. Lavrov
	Rwanda	Mr. Bakuramutsa
	Spain	Mr. Yañez-Barnuevo
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David Hannay

Agenda

An agenda for peace: peace-keeping

Letter dated 15 September 1994 from the Permanent Representatives of Argentina and New Zealand to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1063)

94-86923 (E)

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, *within one week of the date of publication*, to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, room C-178.

The meeting was called to order at 12.45 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

An agenda for peace: peace-keeping

Letter dated 15 September 1994 from the Permanent Representatives of Argentina and New Zealand to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/1994/1063)

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Egypt, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Malaysia, Netherlands, Sweden and Turkey in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Butler (Australia), Mr. Sucharipa (Austria), Mr. Portocarero (Belgium), Mrs. Fréchette (Canada), Mr. Elaraby (Egypt), Mr. Graf Zu Rantzau (Germany), Mr. Hayes (Ireland), Mr. Fulci (Italy), Mr. Maruyama (Japan), Mr. Razali (Malaysia), Mr. Biegman (Netherlands), Mr. Osvald (Sweden) and Mr. Batu (Turkey) took places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President: The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Mr. Mérimée (France) *(interpretation from French):* At the previous meeting a presidential statement was read out announcing the Security Council's intention to stay on the course it adopted in its decision of 3 May 1994. The approach contained in that decision was clarity in defining Security Council procedures and flexibility in the exchanges of information between the Secretariat, members of the Council and other Members of the United Nations.

The formula that has been worked out demonstrates progress in the way in which briefing sessions have been held thus far with troop contributors. They have been conducted with outstanding care by the Secretariat and, apart from a few minor points, have been supported by interested delegations. Many Member States have stated that they want the President of the Security Council in certain cases to be present on the rostrum side by side with the representative of the Secretary-General in order to ensure an even stronger link between the concerns of the troop contributors and the action taken by the body responsible for peace-keeping.

This formula is entirely supported by my delegation. When consultations deal with the establishment, extension or substantial modification of the mandate of an operation, a co-chairmanship formula would be used whereas in all other cases the current formula would be used, because we believe there should be no question of removing the operational conduct of operations away from the Secretariat. On questions of deployment or withdrawal of forces, for example, it would merely be a question of the Secretariat providing information.

On questions of briefings, the presence in the room of members of the Security Council and at the rostrum of the President of that body would help to avoid the impression that certain troop contributors have of being insufficiently heeded by the Security Council.

This would not prejudice the principles governing the Council's procedures which state that that body remains the sole master of its decisions, for there would be no setting up of a subsidiary body of the Council, no creating of a category of members with special prerogatives, and no encroachment on missions entrusted only to the Secretary-General.

This briefing which we feel is desirable — and how could it not be since France is one of the main troop contributors to United Nations peace-keeping operations — is still just a partial, insufficient solution to the general problem of transparency in the activities of the Council.

For us, the solution to this problem is not a question of just slightly opening the door to certain States to allow them to be present in confidential meetings; rather it presupposes a new balance between the public part and the private part of the work of the Council.

Contrary to what is the case at the present time, we believe that we should return to the wise principle of the

rules of procedure whereby the Council meets in public unless it decides otherwise. The current formula is that of work in informal meetings with a few rare exceptions, whereas we believe that eventually we should limit the non-public work to what is necessary in order to reach a broadly acceptable decision as speedily as possible.

Within the next few days France will be circulating as an official document of the General Assembly and the Security Council an *aide-mémoire* stating in detail our position on this point. We hope that all delegations will take careful note of it and will draw the same conclusion as we do that this is the true way to eliminate the frustrations keenly felt by many delegations that have to do with the Council's excessive use of non-public working methods.

For the time being we welcome the presidential statement that has just been adopted. It should provide a welcome addition to the initiative that I have just announced, an initiative the point of which will be to treat the problem at its root.

Mr. Cardenas (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish)*: In adopting presidential statement S/PRST/1994/62, the Security Council has taken a particularly important step in reformulating its procedures. In the same manner, by taking this step it responds to a widespread request by the Members of the United Nations to improve the communication between the Security Council and the troop-contributing countries.

The text adopted in the statement has been the result of intense and constructive negotiations among members of the Council based on the letter dated 15 September 1994 from the delegations of New Zealand and Argentina. It is in fact tangible proof of what can result from an attitude in constant search of agreement and consensus, an approach that has been seen more and more in the Council since the end of the cold war.

In this context I want very particularly to mention the pioneering role played by New Zealand in this process. Its persistence and its skills throughout its present term in the Security Council have made it possible to make progress on this issue, an issue that is now shared by all members of the Council and by many of the Member States that contribute troops to United Nations peace-keeping operations.

The procedure adopted by the Security Council opens a new era in the history of Council procedures because it creates a foreseeable procedure for communication between the Security Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat, on items with regard to the most important decisions of the Council relating to peace-keeping operations.

This mechanism does not in our view prejudge either the direct decision-making process of the Security Council or the fundamental role played by the United Nations Secretariat with respect to the management of peace-keeping operations.

The new mechanism constitutes a first but important step in enabling troop-contributing countries to have the opportunity for dialogue that they deserve as primary players in this process. In this manner, although in a somewhat different context, we are acting in accordance with the spirit implied in Article 44 of the Charter itself.

Argentina has stated in various forums the importance it attaches to the system of collective security foreseen in the Charter. The last four years have been particularly important in this regard. On the one hand, they have witnessed the strong involvement of the Security Council and the United Nations in the resolution of many conflicts which threaten international peace and security. On the other, given the unexpected increase in this activity, they have shown the limitations of the current system of collective security.

Proposals such as the one we have just adopted point to the need to strengthen the Security Council since it responds to a widespread request, which has been heard in the various forums of the Organization, in particular the important Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council.

These requests, above all, are concerned with the principle of the representativeness of the Security Council *vis-à-vis* the Members of the Organization, as implied in paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Charter. They also respond to the need to make the work of the Council more efficient and all of its procedures more transparent.

This decision of the Security Council, reflected in the presidential statement, shows us a path we can continue to follow with caution but also with resolve.

Through the strengthening of the Security Council in the matter of its procedures we are also strengthening its legitimacy and even its efficiency. Thus the dream of

the founders of the United Nations for a better world without the scourge of war or sterile conflicts may become true so that the international community may work peacefully towards the development and well-being of its peoples.

Lastly, Argentina wishes once again to express its gratitude to New Zealand for its inspiration. It wishes also to thank each and every one of the other members of the Council for their cooperation and contribution throughout the process of the negotiation of the statement that has just been read out, and most particularly, all States, which through their notes on the issue or through their statements, have supported this task ungrudgingly.

Argentina wishes, finally, to thank the Secretary-General and his staff for the solid and silent work performed in this field. No one is better placed to be aware of this, and therefore duly to recognize it, than a country which contributes troops to the Organization.

Mr. Keating (New Zealand): The decision which the Security Council has just adopted in the presidential statement which you, Madam President, read, to establish a system of institutionalized consultation with troop-contributing countries is, we believe, of historic significance.

For more than a year now New Zealand has been advocating both inside and outside the Council the importance of such consultations. We are very grateful that it has been possible for colleagues on the Council to reach a consensus on this matter.

As with all decisions by consensus, this has involved compromise. The original New Zealand proposal was for the establishment of a Council committee. Article 29 of the Charter provides for the establishment of subsidiary organs. We already have a number of subsidiary organs. Some, like the sanctions committees, already conduct consultations with Member States that are not on the Security Council, even allowing them to participate in their meetings. It seemed to us that this sort of precedent should be applied to consultation with troop-contributing countries.

But in the face of firm opposition to the establishment of a specific institution for the purpose of consultation, New Zealand and Argentina in September submitted a formal request for a meeting of the Security Council to discuss the matter. We indicated a willingness to look at options less than a formal institution provided that there was a clear decision that consultation would become the norm, that it would be systematized and institutionalized even if it could not be within the framework of a new institution.

We made it clear also that this had to be viewed as a procedural matter regulated solely by paragraph 2 of Article 27 of the Charter — that is, a decision on which only the affirmative votes of nine members were required.

We are pleased, as I said, that we have been able to reach consensus on this matter, because it is of fundamental importance to the future work of the Security Council.

We do have to record, however, our disappointment that this innovation was resisted so strongly, including initially by the Secretary-General. Various arguments have been raised, but at the end of the day they seemed to boil down pretty much to one point: that to accept the Argentine/New Zealand proposal would result in a shift of power within the Organization away from the Secretariat and the Security Council and in favour of the wider membership of the United Nations.

Certainly, it was never our intention in taking this initiative to change the power relationships prescribed in the Charter; far from it. Our intention was rather to give proper effect to the provisions of the Charter and the power relationships envisaged in it.

In this respect, Article 44 is a very important provision. We are aware that some have technical arguments against its relevance or applicability. We believe those arguments are unsound, and quite wrong in law. But putting aside the technical issue, there can be no doubt about the spirit of Article 44.

Certainly in this day of stand-by-forces arrangements, at this point in time when the vast majority of troops under United Nations command are from countries outside the Security Council, operations in particular such as the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM) must be seen as coming exactly within the spirit of Article 44.

When we look closely at Article 44, we see that the Charter founders expected that troop-contributing countries would participate in decisions taken by the Council - I repeat: participate in decisions. This is quite different from the formulation used in Article 31. As

members know, Article 31 deals with participation by States whose interests are specially affected. That Article says only that they may participate, without vote, in the discussion. Article 32, which deals with States that are parties to disputes says only that they may participate.

So clearly the Charter envisaged a much higher level of participation by troop-contributing countries in Council decisions. That is why it is not sufficient to say that the interests of troop-contributing countries can be accommodated simply by inviting them to speak in public debates of the sort we are currently having, important though such opportunities are.

As will be appreciated from what I have said, the purpose of our initiative was to restore a balance, which we believed was provided for in the Charter but which had been lost over the years when the Security Council was inactive and largely a political debating chamber.

Now that the Security Council has resumed its rightful role, it must bring its culture into line with the letter and the spirit of the Charter. It may be that compliance with the Charter actually does involve a shift in the balance of power which has prevailed for 50 years and the diminution of assumed prerogatives. That is why it is so important that consensus was achieved on the decision adopted today, and why we congratulate most warmly all concerned for the vision which is being demonstrated.

As the Security Council in the mid-1990s struggles to discover its proper path, we have to accept that the path will be evolutionary. That is why New Zealand warmly accepted this positive decision adopted today. It is only one step along the road we would have liked to travel. But we acknowledge that some of these further steps will have to come in the future.

I am thinking here about the elements of our initiative which have been postponed for future consideration: first, the need to systematize also the Council's practice of consulting countries with regional or other specific interests, and, secondly, the Council's own internal requirements for information and internal transparency.

In this latter respect, the Council's practice, in our view, is nothing short of primitive, given the policy responsibilities which it performs. My Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs and Trade, the Right Honourable Don McKinnon, expressed our grave reservations on this matter when he spoke in the General Assembly on 27 September last.

He argued that it was essential in the United Nations, just as it is in domestic political systems, to learn from the lessons of modern public-sector management. A cardinal reality of successful modern political management was transparent political accountability. He pointed out that improving the United Nations capacity for undertaking peace-keeping and its collective security responsibilities must be predicated on clear accountability. He went on to say:

> "The management of peace-keeping operations is allocated to the Secretariat. This is necessary and appropriate in the same way any Government delegates responsibility for a complex operation to its public service.
>
> "However, and I speak as a politician and as a Minister responsible for ... Government departments, the days are long gone when a public service mandarin could run a department or major operation without detailed political oversight. This is not a promotion of micro-management, nor am I implying any criticism of the Secretariat staff. But as any politician holding executive office in today's democracies knows, the classic recipe for a failed project is for those who are politically accountable to lose track of implementation or to lose the game plan.
>
> "We saw that all too clearly in the past year in Somalia. Ironically, the Security Council had, in resolution 814 (1993), already foreseen the need in the case of the United Nations Operation in Somalia (UNOSOM II) for detailed political accountability and provided for a committee to follow the operation closely. But the committee was never established.
>
> "New Zealand has proposed in the Security Council that a committee or an ad hoc working group should be established to fill this gap, and enhance the accountability of the Organization to its politically responsible representatives." *(Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings, 7th meeting, p. 27)*

In the days that have passed since then, we have only become more convinced that our original proposal for an institutionalized approach to the oversight of

peace-keeping operations would, because of the information flows that would occur, significantly enhance the quality of Security Council policy decisions. In the Argentine/New Zealand initiative, however, this proposal was refined to a more modest regular series of meetings at the technical level to enhance information flows.

We urge the members of the Council, in the months to come, to continue to work on this issue, as has been agreed in today's decision. For in the end the Council is judged not by the quality of the fine speeches in this Chamber, but by the quality of the policy decisions it takes. We remain deeply concerned that the information base on which the Council takes decisions and adjusts them in the light of rapidly changing circumstances in the field is far too fragile for safety.

Sir David Hannay (United Kingdom): I speak today not just as a member of the Security Council but as the representative of one of the larger troop-contributing countries. At present the United Kingdom has over 4,000 men and women serving around the globe in United Nations peace-keeping operations. They, like others, are deployed in increasingly dangerous operations where, all too often, they face the threat of the hidden mine or the sniper's gun. Like other troop contributors, large and small, we are concerned to have the fullest possible information on the operations in which our men serve and fuller and more regular consultations about the decisions which affect their lives. That is right and proper. When Member States offer their citizens to the United Nations for service in peace-keeping operations they have every right to expect to be informed of developments and to be heard when changes are in prospect. This is not a criticism of existing arrangements but a recognition of the fact that the rapid growth in the scale, complexity and danger of peace-keeping operations has made evident the need for a more regular and predictable pattern of consultations between troop contributors, the Secretariat and Council members.

That has been the driving force behind my delegation's approach to this issue. We have, however, also been concerned that any steps taken to develop, regularize and make more predictable the pattern of consultations should respect the different roles and responsibilities of the Security Council, the Secretary-General and the troop-contributing countries. The decision-making responsibility of the Council as the authorizing body for peace-keeping operations is clear. Equally, it is the Secretary-General to whom peace-keeping personnel are offered by troop-contributing countries and who has a clear responsibility for their management and for the conduct of the operations in the field under the mandates given by the Security Council. Any blurring of those lines of responsibility would lead to confusion which would be in the interest neither of the troop contributors nor of the furtherance of international peace and security. For the same reason we have, throughout the discussions which led to the adoption of this statement, been concerned to avoid the creation of procedures which might lead to micromanagement of peace-keeping operations by the Security Council or to disruption of the chain of command running through the force commander and the Secretary-General's special representative to the Secretary-General.

Our approach has therefore been based on the two guiding principles to which I have just alluded, first, the clear need for enhanced arrangements for consultation and, secondly, the importance of preserving the clear distinction between the roles and responsibilities of the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop contributors. It was on the basis of these principles that the United Kingdom circulated an informal paper at the end of last week which sought to combine the ideas drawn from the proposals of the Permanent Representatives of Argentina and New Zealand — whose initiative in bringing this issue to the Council we warmly welcome — and those of other delegations, including our own. We are delighted that agreement has now been reached on the basis of that paper. What we must now do is to implement the changes described in the Council's statement and to ensure that they work to the benefit of all and to the more effective furtherance of the United Nations increasingly arduous but necessary involvement in peace-keeping worldwide.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): Several thousand Russian citizens are serving in various United Nations peace-keeping operations in different parts of the world. The Russian Federation therefore attaches great importance to the problem of strengthening the mechanisms for consultations and exchange of information between members of the Security Council, troop contributors to United Nations peace-keeping operations and the Secretariat. Troop contributors make a useful contribution to the conduct of United Nations peace-keeping operations, and their active participation in such exchanges of views should help to enhance the effectiveness of peace-keeping activities.

The Russian delegation notes with satisfaction the established practice whereby the Secretariat meets with

troop contributors, with the participation of members of the Security Council. We are prepared to expand that practice and believe that the exchange of views with troop contributors should focus on questions that require special attention, especially with regard to any extension or change in existing mandates and the deployment of new peace-keeping operations, so that operational questions can be discussed with the special representatives of the Secretary-General or troop commanders, and so on.

In this connection, we believe that the presidential statement just adopted at the welcome initiative of Argentina and New Zealand contains a useful set of procedures that expand on existing practice in this area. As the statement says, our delegation is prepared to continue, in a pragmatic and flexible manner, to cooperate in such measures.

The Russian delegation believes that expanded dialogue on these questions will help maintain broad political support for United Nations peace-keeping operations and for future improvements in the mechanism for consultations with troop-contributing countries based on acquired experience. Of course, such mechanism should be applied in a flexible and pragmatic way and should take into account the authority of the Security Council and the United Nations Charter.

In conclusion, I would note that we are pleased that our decision had begun to be implemented even before its adoption. I have learned that today, in one of the meeting rooms where a briefing session was held for members of the Security Council and countries contributing troops to the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL), the name-plate of the President of the Security Council figured on the rostrum.

Mr. Sardenberg (Brazil): The subject of communication between troop-contributing countries, the Security Council and the Secretariat is one to which the delegation of Brazil has always attached great importance. Today, the Security Council has decided to take a first and significant step to improve the procedures in this field.

My delegation would like to pay a tribute to the delegations of Argentina and New Zealand for having taken the initiative of bringing the issue to the attention of the Council in their letter dated 15 September last. We fully supported their move.

The holding of regular consultations between the troop-contributing countries, the Secretariat and the members of the Security Council has been considered a complex scheme with constitutional and procedural aspects. At the same time it was a necessary and urgent measure that had to be adopted in response to the justified calls made by the great majority of Member States that are troop contributors and are not represented in the Council.

The arrangements adopted by the Council reflect a pragmatic and flexible approach to the question and may be further improved in the future as required. Brazil supports the institutionalization of the practice of regular exchanges of information and views between troop-contributing countries, members of the Council and the Secretariat in the conviction that such a mechanism would constitute an important measure for deepening dialogue among those three parties. It would enhance both the transparency and the effectiveness of the Security Council as well as of the Secretariat *vis-à-vis* the membership of the United Nations in planning and executing peace-keeping operations.

As mentioned earlier, the procedures adopted today are only the first step in the direction of further improving the working methods of the Council. My delegation underscores the fact, as the President stated today, that these arrangements are not exhaustive and may take a variety of forms, including informal communication between the Council and other countries especially affected, such as countries in the region and other relevant States. In many cases, neighbouring States would be instrumental in ensuring the prompt and smooth deployment of a particular peace-keeping operation. Furthermore, not only troop-contributing countries but also countries making other kinds of contributions, such as financial, material and logistic resources, would have to be consulted. In addition, consultations with particular States or groups of States that may assist in the political and diplomatic negotiations would be relevant.

The Brazilian delegation looks forward to continuing to cooperate towards the further improvement of the working methods of the Council in regard to all relevant bodies of our Organization.

The President: In view of the lateness of the hour I intend, with the concurrence of members of the Council, to suspend the meeting now until 4.30 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.20 p.m. and resumed at 5.30 p.m.

The President: I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Greece and Ukraine in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zacharakis (Greece) and Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

Mr. Yáñez-Barnuevo (Spain) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The debate we are holding at this meeting of the Security Council — following the meeting in which the President of the Council, on behalf of the members of the Council, issued the presidential statement on the improvement of procedures of communication and consultation between States that are members and States that are not members of the Council, particularly countries that contribute troops to peace-keeping operations — clearly shows the importance we attach to the action decided on today by the Security Council.

The backdrop for the procedures established by virtue of that presidential statement consists of the expectations and broadly shared aspirations of States Members of the Organization to establish better and more effective communication between members of the Security Council and the other States Members of the Organization. In particular, it has become increasingly clear that there is a need to intensify consultations and exchanges of information between the Security Council and troop-contributing countries about the development of peace-keeping operations, without this affecting the responsibilities and functions of the Security Council and the Secretary-General under the Charter.

Guided by its conviction that the States Members of the United Nations as a whole should be more closely associated with the work of the Security Council — which, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter, acts on behalf of all of them — the Spanish Government has attached particular importance to the establishment of the most appropriate channels to meet this need.

I wish to recall here that already in 1992 Spain, along with other countries, submitted to the Special Committee on Peace-keeping Operations concrete proposals for the promotion of more frequent and more regular consultations between members of the Security Council, countries that provide contingents to a given peace-keeping operation, and the Secretariat. These proposals were partially reflected in General Assembly resolution 47/71, dated 14 December 1992. The purpose was then, and is now, to make it possible for the Security Council and the Secretariat to take into account the concerns felt and the views expressed by the States that contribute to peace-keeping operations on questions of particular importance to those States such as the extension, modification or termination of the mandate of a given operation or the emergence of unforeseen developments in the course of an operation that might require action by the Council.

It is obvious that some significant advances have recently been made in the processes of exchange of information with the Member States as a whole and, in particular with the troop-contributing countries. In this respect, my delegation wishes to put on record its appreciation of the work done by the Secretariat in convening briefings with countries that contribute troops to given operations, and we encourage it to pursue that course. None the less, it was clear that those procedures were inadequate and that a new impetus — a politically significant impetus — was required.

In this connection, the Security Council's presidential statement of 3 May of this year (S/PRST/1994/22) was an important landmark. In that statement the Council recognized the consequences of its decisions on peace-keeping operations for the States Members of the Organization, and in particular for the countries that provide contingents to the operations. In stating its intention to keep under review the provisions dealing with communications with States that are not members of the Council, it laid the groundwork for a gradual adaptation of the procedures of communication and consultation to the new needs that were becoming harder and harder to overlook. Hence, the statement of 3 May 1994 provided the framework for the initiative of Argentina and New Zealand, which my delegation considers very valuable and the spirit of which we fully share.

The presidential statement in which that initiative was given form today, in addition to a detailed description of the procedures for consultations and

exchanges of information that will now begin, contains an expression of the readiness of the Security Council to review those procedures in the light of the experience it gains. My delegation considers this provision particularly important since it will make it possible for us to continue to make progress in intensifying consultations between members of the Council and troop-contributing countries, as well as with other States that are especially interested. In particular, we have in mind countries directly involved in the search for a political solution to a given conflict or situation where a peace-keeping operation is deployed, such as the members of a "group of friends" of the Secretary-General for that particular peace process.

I wish to conclude by expressing my delegation's conviction that today's presidential statement is a major contribution to transparency and effectiveness in the work of the Security Council. As such, we believe that it will open up a new and fruitful stage in relations between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the Members of the Organization.

Mr. Marker (Pakistan): The decisions taken by the Security Council through the presidential statement read out at the 3448th meeting of the Council represent another important link in the overall efforts to improve and rationalize the functioning of the Security Council and to add to the transparency of the Council's work. We are especially grateful to the delegations of Argentina and New Zealand for the leading role they played in the preparation, negotiation and finalization of that statement.

As one of the leading troop-contributing countries, Pakistan has a special interest in the subject under discussion.

I wish to take this opportunity to state that in the view of my delegation these decisions do not represent the culmination of an exercise. It is, instead, an auspicious beginning, and it is the earnest hope of my delegation that this beginning will be built upon in the days to come.

We are particularly gratified that, with the increase in the number and complexity of United Nations peace-keeping operations, there is a growing realization of the need for better communication, understanding, consultation and coordination between the Security Council, the troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat. In this context, briefings of troop-contributing countries by the Secretariat have already been pretty well institutionalized.

The troop-contributing countries not only need to be informed about important developments pertaining to the peace-keeping operations where their troops are committed but also require to be adequately consulted regarding decisions having a bearing on their contingents. We regard this issue essentially in the light of Article 44 of the Charter of the United Nations.

We therefore especially welcome the acknowledgement, in the presidential statement, that the arrangements described therein were not exhaustive, that the Council would keep arrangements for the exchange of information and views with troop contributors under review and that it stood ready to consider further measures to enhance arrangements in the light of experience gained.

In our view, improved arrangements for consultations between Council members and the concerned troop-contributing countries prior to important decisions pertaining to peace-keeping operations would in no way infringe upon the powers and responsibilities of the Security Council.

Mr. Li Zhaoxing (China) *(interpretation from Chinese)*: It is stipulated explicitly in the Charter of the United Nations that the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security resides in the Security Council. This not only shows the solemn rights given by the entire membership to the Security Council, but also demonstrates that the Council should be responsible to the Member States in carrying out its duties.

In recent years the United Nations peace-keeping operations have been fruitful in facilitating the resolution of conflicts and maintaining world peace and security. As a result, wide-ranging attention has been drawn to the question of how the Security Council might better play its peace-keeping role in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter.

At the same time, with the expansion of United Nations peace-keeping operations, both in frequency and in terms of coverage, and bearing in mind the fact that troop-contributing countries now make up more than one third of the membership of the United Nations, Member States are attaching ever-increasing importance to the Organization's peace-keeping operations.

It is for the very purpose of improving the Council's working procedures in dealing with peace-keeping issues

to make them better suited to the needs of the changed situation that the Security Council is considering this item today. The Chinese delegation adopts a positive and welcoming attitude to this process.

As an ancient Chinese saying goes,

"One will be enlightened by listening to various views, and benighted by heeding only a one-sided view."

In order to make the United Nations peace-keeping operations more effective and enable them to continue to play an active role, we must continue to act in a flexible and practical manner, genuinely strengthening links between the Council and the States Members of the Organization — especially the troop-contributing countries.

Before making such major decisions as one authorizing a peace-keeping operation the Security Council should engage in a timely exchange of information with Member States and with the Secretariat and should listen carefully to the views of all — in particular, the parties directly involved, as well as the neighbouring countries and the regional organizations concerned. This would not only increase transparency and democratization in the Council's work and improve its efficiency and efficacy, but also — and this is more important — further enhance the authenticity of its decisions. The Security Council would thus be in a better position to fulfil the mandates provided in the Charter and to play a more constructive role in the maintenance of world peace and security.

Mr. Kovanda (Czech Republic): I should like, first, to congratulate you warmly, Madam, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November and, at the same time, to thank Sir David Hannay for his remarkable leadership of the Council during October.

The Czech Republic has almost 1,000 troops and military observers in United Nations peace-keeping operations in the former Yugoslavia, in Mozambique and in Liberia. Another small group is ready to leave for Georgia. We have previously participated in Angola and Somalia. My country thus ranks among the fairly important troop contributors, especially taking into account its total population of a little over 10 million.

This is one of the perspectives that led my delegation to support, from the very outset, the principle of expanding the scope of information and, indeed, cooperation between the Security Council and troop contributors. Last January, during our presidency of the Council, we initiated a small step in this direction by convening the first meeting between the United Nations Operation in Somalia troop contributors and Security Council members. Such meetings have since become routine. Therefore, we wholeheartedly applaud the efforts of our distinguished colleagues from Argentina and New Zealand, who have persevered with the present initiative.

On the other hand, as a member of the Council, we have also gained some insight as to what arrangements are practical, as opposed to burdensome.

The arrangements that the Security Council has decided upon, as elucidated in the presidential statement that was made earlier today, appear to my delegation to he a good balance between the constant thirst of non-members of the Council for information, the need of troop contributors to be consulted on important developments in "their" peace-keeping operations, the necessity that the Security Council be solely responsible for the actual decisions reached, and the imperative that actual peace-keeping management remain in the hands of the Secretariat.

The steps outlined in the presidential statement in question do not necessarily answer every possible question. For example, they do not specify who is entitled to call for a joint meeting of Security Council members and troop contributors. Such formal "shortcomings" — if that is what they are — do not trouble my delegation. After all, this is, in a sense, an internal decision of the Council — an addition, perhaps, to its rules of procedure. which for over a decade have had only "provisional" status anyway. The important thing is that an important step has been taken — a breakthrough even — and the actual shape of the envisaged consultations will be determined as much by actual practices, which no doubt will evolve and assume a routine of their own, as by the letter of the presidential statement.

Thus the exact form of these consultations will probably vary to a certain extent from Council President to Council President. And we are particularly happy, Madam President, that you might be the first to launch these consultations, continuing your efforts to improve communications between the Council and other Members — efforts which, during your previous tour of duty as President, resulted in the lasting practices of, for example, regular meetings with the Chairmen of regional

groups and the posting of the agenda of informal consultations in the *Journal*.

The President: I thank the representative of the Czech Republic for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Ayewah (Nigeria): Let me begin by thanking the delegations of Argentina and New Zealand for their initiative on this important subject, which affects in a fundamental way the responsibility of the Security Council in the maintenance of international peace and security. We must admire the determined and pragmatic manner in which the two delegations have endeavoured to obtain consensus on the subject.

During our intervention in the debate on the Security Council's report to the General Assembly we welcomed this initiative, aimed at creating a more effective system of consultation between Security Council members and troop-contributing countries, as a useful contribution to the further development of the United Nations peace-keeping capacity. Indeed, the need for such consultations has been overwhelmingly acknowledged by the wider membership of the United Nations. This initiative, therefore, responds to a felt need. Furthermore, Nigeria, as a major troop-contributing country of long standing, has always taken the view that consultations between troop contributors and the Security Council are not only desirable but necessary for the full and effective discharge of our Charter obligations. We are particularly encouraged in this regard by the provisions of Article 44 of the United Nations Charter. Our decision today, which seeks to formalize and institutionalize the procedure for such consultations, conveyed in the presidential statement that you read this morning, Madam Chairman, represents a pragmatic step in the right direction. We welcome it and fully support its import.

Peace-keeping is one area of the Council's work that has implications not only for the State where such an operation is undertaken but also for troop-contributing countries, most of which are not usually members of the Council. Given the considerable increase in the number and complexity of such operations, the call for a more systematized form of consultation and dialogue between Council members and troop contributors serves the interests of both sides. Such a dialogue would not only enrich the decisions of the Council but would also enhance the legitimacy of those decisions. In addition, the greater transparency that would result from the improved consultation procedures would greatly help to strengthen the political support of troop-contributing countries for the various peace-keeping mandates of the Organization.

The statement we agreed this morning contains important elements of our collective desire to achieve greater transparency, efficiency and democratization in the Council's working methods. The measures we have decided to institute are very flexible and do not blur the respective roles of the existing organs of the United Nations system involved in peace-keeping operations. They are, however, not exhaustive, and we welcome the intention of the Council to keep the arrangements under review.

Mr. Al-Sameen (Oman): At the outset, allow me to convey my sincere thanks to the Permanent Mission of Argentina and to the Permanent Mission of New Zealand for their initiative and efforts in finalizing together consensus on this sensitive and pivotal issue, which resulted in the issuance of the presidential statement that was agreed by the Council this morning.

My delegation welcomes the statement that you read out on behalf of the Council, Madam President. We are confident that the current positive prevailing conditions in the Council will strengthen the effectiveness of its work and enhance its credibility in discharging the tasks entrusted to it. Nothing can better illustrate this trend than today's presidential statement, which we consider at this stage to be the first step in the right direction.

My delegation believes that the consultations between members of the Council and the troop-contributing countries should be intensified and that information should be exchanged in a manner that would be consistent and complementary to the work of the Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries in areas of peace-keeping operations. My delegation considers that these consultations are in line with our work and will further enhance decisions by the Council.

While observing that the arrangements referred to in the statement are not exhaustive, my delegation believes that it is inevitable for us all together in the future to collaborate vigorously in this regard. And by then the Council will evaluate such procedures, which indeed, according to my delegation's view, will be crowned with success.

Transparency in the Council's work is a positive step and will help all Members of our Organization. The Council will give its utmost consideration to the

multinational discussions of peace-keeping operations between troop-contributing countries participating in these operations and provide them with the necessary information.

The President: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the United States.

Speaking in my national capacity, I want to join my colleagues in emphasizing the significance of the presidential statement and in thanking the representatives of Argentina and New Zealand for the initiative and hard work that they put into this project. Let me also thank the British Mission for its role as midwife in this important delivery. In our judgement, fuller and more regular exchanges between Security Council members, troop contributors and the Secretariat are directly beneficial to all concerned. They are a necessary step in ensuring that Council decisions to extend, terminate or significantly change peace-keeping mandates are taken with the benefit of the views of those Member States whose personnel are most directly involved.

We understand the importance of keeping the communications link strong between those who write the resolutions and those countries that contribute to carrying them out. Today's action will significantly enhance the working relationship between the Council and troop contributors in several important ways. First, it creates predictability. Meetings between the Council, troop contributors and the Secretariat will be held on a regular basis and, whenever possible, announced in advance in the United Nations *Journal* whenever mandate extensions, terminations or significant changes are in view. Secondly, it initiates a monthly review by the Council of the expected schedule of meetings involving the Secretariat, troop contributors and Council members. Thirdly, it provides for enhanced opportunities for timely and urgent exchanges of information and views in the event of unforeseen developments profoundly affecting peace-keeping operations, such as occurred in Rwanda last April. Fourthly, it provides for a discussion that is well informed and well focused by providing an agenda in advance to all participants. Finally, it provides the basis for more direct exchanges between the troop contributors and Council members by means of meetings that are jointly chaired by the President of the Security Council and a representative of the Secretariat, nominated by the Secretary-General.

While these changes bring important and valuable improvement to the working relationship between Council members, the Secretariat and troop contributors, they do not and cannot in any way alter the fundamental division of competence and responsibility between the Secretariat and the Security Council. The meetings undertaken as a consequence of today's statement will not supplant, but be an addition to, the normal troop-contributor consultations concerning operational and similar matters. Secondly, we will pursue this important innovation in a pragmatic and flexible manner, conscious of the need not to overburden the Council or to encroach upon the Council's primary security tasks. Finally, it will remain the Council's unique responsibility to mandate peace-keeping operations, as it will remain the Secretariat's task to implement and manage them. We look forward to the clarity of purpose that we hope will emerge from this transparency.

I now resume my function as President of the Council.

The next speaker is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Maruyama (Japan): As this is the first time that I have spoken at a formal meeting of the Security Council, let me extend my heartfelt congratulations to you, Madam President, on your assumption of the presidency.

At the outset, I should like to commend the delegations of Argentina and New Zealand for their very welcome initiative in coordinating efforts with the members of the Council to have a presidential statement issued on the subject of communication between members and non-members of the Council. The Government of Japan strongly supports the proposal contained therein to enhance, in a pragmatic and flexible manner, the arrangements for consultations and exchanges of information with countries contributing to a peace-keeping operation.

At this time of great change in the international situation since the end of the cold war, United Nations peace-keeping operations are expected to play a central role in the maintenance of world peace and security. However, in order to facilitate the contribution of considerable financial and human resources by Member States and to render United Nations peace-keeping operations as a whole more acceptable to Member States, consultations among the Secretariat, countries contributing to an operation, and the members of the Security Council are of crucial importance. An efficient

mechanism must be established to involve all of them in the consultation process.

When Japan first proposed this idea several years ago, it was received with little enthusiasm, but in recent years it appears to have gained the support of many countries. In fact, it has been incorporated in several General Assembly resolutions. I might add that the mechanism for consultations, both at United Nations Headquarters and in the field, among the countries and United Nations offices concerned contributed greatly to the success of the Cambodian operation, in which my own country was deeply involved.

Let me also note that the arrangements proposed in the presidential statement for consultations and the exchange of information will contribute to greater transparency in the work of the Security Council while paying due regard to the need to maintain efficiency in its work. This in turn will enhance the legitimacy and credibility of the Security Council, especially when questions concerning peace-keeping operations are raised.

International confidence in United Nations peace-keeping operations will be greatly enhanced if consultations are held and views exchanged among the countries concerned. This will also facilitate the smooth supply of equipment, financing, expertise or advice necessary for the successful deployment of civilian as well as military personnel. For example, any change made in the mandate of a peace-keeping operation which has substantial budgetary implications will be of concern to the major donor States. In this context, "competent groups of Member States on the Council's programme of work" should be invited to participate in the consultations. This consultative mechanism was referred to in the statement made in May by the President of the Security Council (S/PRST/1994/22).

In this respect, I should like to point out that the Secretariat has traditionally interpreted the term "troop-contributing countries" in a broad sense, to include countries making contributions of various sorts, not just of troops. Japan fully supports the intention of the Secretariat and the President of the Security Council to maintain this tradition in calling consultations.

In closing, I should like to express the hope that the Security Council will keep the proposal for a consultation mechanism under review and that it will explore further measures to enhance such arrangements.

The President: I thank the representative of Japan for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Austria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sucharipa (Austria): Madam President, I should like to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of November. Likewise, we express our appreciation for the leadership exerted by your predecessor, Sir David Hannay.

Austria has a long-standing tradition and active engagement in United Nations peace-keeping activities. We thus are deeply interested in effective cooperation and a close dialogue between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries. With this in mind, we welcomed the initiative launched by New Zealand and Argentina, which resulted in today's Security Council decision.

The Austrian Foreign Minister, in his statement during the general debate of the current session of the General Assembly, referred to the need to improve the interaction between the Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries. My delegation has repeatedly addressed this issue during the current session of the General Assembly. In a letter to the President of the Council, Austria underlined the need for more transparency in decisions regarding peace-keeping operations. Similar letters were addressed to the Council by other delegations.

We therefore appreciate the decision taken today by the Security Council, within its own prerogative, to enhance the channels of communication with troop-contributing countries - even if this decision falls short of original proposals to set up a formal subsidiary body of the Council.

We believe that the implementation of this decision on the procedure to be followed in future will constitute an important step in the direction of the more transparent functioning of the Council. By ensuring that non-members with a special interest in peace-keeping operations are kept informed on a regular basis and that their opinions are taken into consideration in the decision-making process, the Council has responded to a most urgent request by the Organization's membership at large. We take note of the pragmatic nature of the

procedure as outlined and are looking forward to participating in it in a constructive way.

In the view of my delegation, input by non-members might contribute to more effective decision-making by the Council and produce increased political willingness by Governments to ensure participation in peace-keeping missions.

The following months will, hopefully, show that these consultations can meet our expectations. It is relevant to note that the decision adopted today is to a certain extent also the byproduct of relevant proposals and discussions in the context of the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Security Council. We are pleased to see that, as far as peace-keeping operations are concerned, the Security Council, with today's statement, has responded fairly swiftly to the calls for greater transparency. We have taken note with great interest of the statements made in this context today by the members of the Security Council and, in particular, by the Permanent Representative of France.

Let me therefore express the hope that today's action may augur well for future cooperation on other topics also between the Security Council and interested States Members of the United Nations currently not serving on the Council.

Today's decision constitutes, in the view of the Austrian delegation, an important step in our endeavours to arrive at a more equal balance between the Security Council and the General Assembly in general. We therefore note with satisfaction that the Council will keep under review arrangements to improve the quality and speed of the flow of information available to support Security Council decision-making.

The President: I thank the representative of Austria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Sweden. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Osvald (Sweden): I wish first of all to congratulate you, Madam President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of November. We are certain that the Council is in good hands.

I have the honour to speak on behalf of the four Nordic troop-contributing countries: Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden.

The Nordic countries have always been strong supporters of United Nations peace-keeping operations. Over the years, we have contributed a considerable number of troops to these operations. At present, almost 5,600 men and women from our countries are participating in ongoing United Nations peace-keeping operations. Against this background, we have taken a keen interest in the discussion in the Security Council on the timely initiative of Argentina and New Zealand relating to a strengthening of the arrangements for consultations between troop-contributing countries, members of the Security Council and the Secretary-General.

We welcome and strongly support the important presidential statement that you, Madam President, made today on behalf of the Security Council on this issue. Thanks to the efforts of Argentina and New Zealand and the helpful and constructive way their proposal has been handled in the Council, all troop-contributing countries can today look forward to a new chapter in the relations between them and the Security Council.

For a long time we have been stressing that there is an urgent need for improved procedures for consultations between troop contributors, members of the Security Council and the Secretary-General. This is reflected, *inter alia*, in General Assembly resolution 48/43 of 10 December 1993, which was a Nordic initiative and was adopted by consensus. It was further stressed in a letter of 6 October 1994 from the Nordic ambassadors to the President of the Security Council.

We firmly believe that an enhanced dialogue with the Security Council and increased transparency in these matters will be of crucial importance in maintaining the broad political support for United Nations peace-keeping operations that has been the tradition in our countries. Such a dialogue would also, in our opinion, improve the efficiency of the operations. In our view, the consultations with the troop contributors should be structured, focused on areas of particular concern and take place on a regular basis, as well as when extensions and/or modifications of existing mandates are being considered.

The modalities and practical arrangements for the consultations as they are spelled out in the presidential

statement will provide a good framework for achieving these objectives. We are prepared to play our part in making the consultations worthwhile and useful for all concerned.

We note with satisfaction that the Security Council will keep the new arrangements under review and that it stands ready to consider further measures to enhance the arrangements in the light of experience. One area for future consideration would be to make efforts, when feasible, to engage in consultations those countries that realistically may be in a position to contribute troops to a new peace-keeping operation before a decision is taken by the Security Council to launch the new operation in question. There are of course also other ideas that could be further elaborated.

Let me finish by assuring you, Madam President, that the Nordic troop-contributing countries are prepared to do their utmost to cooperate with the Security Council and the Secretary-General to reach our common goal of making United Nations peace-keeping operations as effective and efficient as possible in fulfilling the mandates given to them by the Security Council.

The President: I thank the representative of Sweden for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Germany. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Graf zu Rantzau (Germany): Allow me to congratulate you, Madam President, on your assumption of the exalted office of President of the Security Council. The high degree of diplomatic ability for which you are known guarantees that the Council's proceedings will be smooth.

I should also like to express our appreciation for the competence with which your predecessor in the office, Sir David Hannay, conducted the affairs of the Council.

On 15 September 1994 the Permanent Representatives of Argentina and New Zealand wrote to the President of the Security Council, taking the initiative to try to improve the flow of information between Council members and troop-contributing countries. Today, less than two months later — which would seem to be a record — we welcome the decisions taken by the Security Council as outlined in the presidential statement made earlier today at the 3448th meeting of the Council. We recognize that significant progress has been achieved since the presidential statement of 3 May 1994. We interpret this as evidence of an increased willingness on the part of the members of the Council to react to the legitimate demands and expectations of troop contributors to be heard. It also indicates the readiness of the members of the Council to progress towards greater transparency in all aspects of the Council's work.

As we have stated before, consultations with troop-contributing countries are crucial for the effectiveness of the Security Council's work. Timely and comprehensive consultations with troop contributors are also vital for the credibility and authority of the Council's decisions.

In the light of what I have just said, we look forward to the early implementation of the decisions taken by the Council. We note the degree of flexibility contained in the presidential statement that the arrangements described are not exhaustive. We therefore believe that further steps will be taken where necessary.

The President: I thank the representative of Germany for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Canada. I invite her to take a place at the Council table and to make her statement.

Mrs. Fréchette (Canada) (*interpretation from French*): At the outset, allow me to congratulate you, Madam President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I am convinced that the Council will benefit once again from your intelligent and enlightened leadership this month. I also wish to thank your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir David Hannay, who led the Security Council's work efficiently and diligently in October.

Canada welcomes the issuance of the presidential statement on this subject by the Security Council. The Council's decision to embark on a process that will make possible increased consultation with States that are not Council members, and in particular with troop-contributing countries, is an important phase in the pursuit of our common goal of greater effectiveness in peace-keeping operations. As you know, Madam President, Canada has long urged the Council to hold broader consultations, especially when its decisions could have serious consequences for the troops on the ground, as well as on the conditions in which the Council's mandates are implemented. More specifically, we firmly

believe that whenever the Council considers altering, extending or ending the mandates of peace-keeping operations in which my country is participating, we must have the opportunity not only to make our views known to the Council, but also to discuss these questions with it frankly and openly before it takes a final decision, as it must do.

(spoke in English)

In the spring of this year, my Government invited a number of major troop-contributing countries to a meeting in Ottawa to discuss this matter and others, with the objective of improving our collective response to peace-keeping operations. The presidential statement adopted this morning by the Council addresses many of the concerns identified in Ottawa, and subsequently developed in a working group, on the subject of political direction, led by Malaysia and the Netherlands. While this presidential statement could not address the concerns of all, it does address those very specific elements of greatest importance to Canada.

Canada is pleased to note that the statement also recognizes the clear distinction between those occasions when the Council should and must consult with troop-contributing countries and those other occasions when it is imperative that the Secretariat meet with contributors to discuss operational matters. We welcome the fact that this distinction has been recognized in the presidential statement. We, the Member States, should strive to ensure that there will be no blurring of the roles of the Council, the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries in the conduct of effective peace-keeping operations.

To conclude, Canada congratulates the members of the Council on their decision to implement the procedures set out in this presidential statement. Canada particularly commends Argentina and New Zealand for their efforts in bringing this matter before members of the Council for their consideration. The Council's recognition that this issue is of great importance to many of the Member States will, in our view, do much to encourage wider and fuller participation in future peace-keeping missions.

The President: I thank the representative of Canada for the very kind words she addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Netherlands. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Biegman (Netherlands): Let me first congratulate you, Madam President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November.

I am happy to have the opportunity to address the Council on the important matter before it today. As a substantial contributor of troops to peace-keeping operations around the world, the Netherlands has always strongly advocated more regular interaction between all parties involved in those operations. In October my delegation, together with our Benelux partners, Belgium and Luxemburg, underlined in a letter to your predecessor the importance we attach to improving the procedures for the exchange of information and consultation between the Council, the Secretariat and countries participating in peace-keeping operations.

We therefore warmly welcome the presidential statement the Council adopted this morning. It is, in the view of my delegation, a far-reaching and extremely important step on the path towards finding more suitable mechanisms to improve cooperation and communication between all parties involved in peace-keeping operations. I should like to express my sincere appreciation to the delegations of New Zealand and Argentina whose initiative gave birth to the discussions on the new procedures that were adopted by the Council today. At the same time, it must be admitted that the successful conclusion of the discussions of the Council on this item would not have been possible without the active participation and cooperation of all members of the Council,including especially the previous presidency, the United Kingdom. It is therefore appropriate to congratulate the Council as a whole on the successful outcome.

The Security Council has lent its ear to the numerous demands that were formulated in the general debate this year for enhanced transparency and better consultations with troop-contributing countries. This is a very positive development in the institutional relations between the Council and the General Assembly, which will, we hope, enhance the spirit of solidarity needed to cope with the increasing challenges of the Organization. The new procedures adopted today reflect the awareness that the implementation of the decisions and resolutions of the Council require cooperation and collective action. The Council cannot - by itself- ensure the implementation of the growing number of its resolutions. It needs the active participation and involvement of all Members of

the United Nations. It is in this respect that the presidential statement has special significance.

I have stated on other occasions that enhanced transparency of the work of the Council can strengthen public support in the Member States for participation in peace-keeping operations. The increase in the number and complexity of these operations makes it more and more difficult to find enough countries willing to make troops available to the United Nations. The new procedures will provide the Member States with better channels of information on the operations mandated by the Council and will, it is hoped, lead to increased involvement on their part. It is my delegation's hope that countries will make active use of the enlarged possibilities for interaction with the Council. It is extremely important that the Council receive the fullest possible support in carrying out its unique mandate to maintain international peace and security.

Let me conclude by assuring the Council that the Netherlands, for its part, will certainly participate in the newly created opportunities to exchange views with the Council, as a further expression of our determination to contribute to the collective efforts of the Organization in maintaining international peace and security.

The President: I thank the representative of the Netherlands for the very kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Malaysia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Razali (Malaysia): Madam President, the delegation of Malaysia would like to thank your predecessor, Sir David Hannay, for steering the work of the Council during the month of October. My delegation would also like to support your efforts this month in the Council, fully aware of your capabilities and mindful of the role of the United States in the Council.

The presidential statement adopted earlier today by the Council is relevant and timely; it is a good piece of work. It follows upon the joint initiative taken by Argentina and New Zealand, both non-permanent members of the Council, and efforts of the British Ambassador as President last month. The fact that meetings will be chaired jointly by the President of the Council and the Secretariat is a good innovation. We outside the Council would like to think that we have, in some measure, made a contribution, given our increasing calls for direct consultations between the Council and troop-contributing countries. We see this decision as an important step marking a positive change within the Council, fitting into the broader matrix of the necessary changes that this Council will have to undergo and undertake in the future.

When he addressed the General Assembly on 5 October 1994, the Malaysian Deputy Prime Minister highlighted "... the peace-keeping operations decided on by the Security Council provide no clear institutional structure for consultation, especially between non-Security-Council member troop-contributing countries and Security Council members." (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings, 18th meeting, p. 13*). This indeed has been the crux of the problem which a number of troop- contributing countries have wanted the Security Council to address.

Malaysia, which has been involved in United Nations peace-keeping operations since the Congo in the 1960s, has always maintained that troop-contributing countries must participate in the decision-making process of the Council. In fact, this is provided for in Article 44 of the Charter. Earlier this year, we formally communicated to the President of this Council the urgent need for direct consultations between the Council and troop- contributing countries.

The demand for enhanced consultations has been reinforced by the fact that about two thirds of the troops serving in peace-keeping operations are contributed by non-permanent members and non-members of the Security Council. In Somalia, for example, the United Nations force is now composed almost exclusively of such troops. In that light, it would not seem logical, for both practical and political reasons, that a vast majority of the troop contributors should continue to depend only on ad hoc meetings, without any systematic routine for obtaining current information and for contributing to the formulation of policies on matters affecting their troops. That is why the troop-contributing countries have insisted on being more fully consulted by the Council, without prejudice to the exercise by the Council of its decision-making authority under the Charter.

Frequent consultations and a steadier flow of information between the Council and troop contributors would also broaden the basis of support for Council resolutions, thus enhancing the prospects for their effective and successful implementation. An institutionalized system for consultation and communication could augment the political support for

peace-keeping operations and increase the commitment of troop-contributing countries.

We note the observations in the presidential statement that

> "the Security Council recalls that the arrangements described herein are not exhaustive" (*S/PV.3448, p. 7*)

and that the Council

> "stands ready to consider further measures to enhance arrangements in the light of experience". (*Ibid., p. 8*)

The Malaysian delegation is ready to work with all parties to further elaborate steps to fully meet the needs of a comprehensive interaction between the Council and troop-contributing countries.

We must make the point that the Council decision reflected in the statement did not address all the issues the troop-contributing countries had raised. In a paper entitled "Political Direction and Support", prepared following a meeting at Ottawa earlier this year, organized by the Canadian Government, the non-permanent members and troop-contributing countries outside the Council spelled out details pertaining to these consultations. They stressed that such consultations should take place whenever one or more of the following situations arose: when the mandate of a new peace-keeping operation was being formulated; when the concept and/or plan of operation of a peace-keeping operation was being considered; when the extension of the mandate of a peace-keeping operation was being considered; when a substantive modification of the mandate of an existing peace-keeping operation, including the broadening or narrowing of its geographical scope, changes in rules of engagement, introduction of new functions or components and so forth, was being considered; when significant developments occurred which, in the opinion of the Secretary-General, of members of the Security Council or of troop contributors, were likely to affect materially the functioning of the operation or its ability to fulfil its mandate; or when the withdrawal of the operation in whole or in part was being considered.

Most of the troop-contributing countries involved in the Ottawa meeting were also agreed on the need for the establishment of a subsidiary organ at an appropriate time. The task of this organ would be to coordinate consultations and the flow of information between the Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries in order to facilitate broad common understanding between troop-contributing countries, the Council and the Secretary-General on the objectives of a United Nations operation and on the range of measures to achieve them.

Again, we would like to express our appreciation to you, Madam President, and to your colleagues for the adoption of this decision. Malaysia looks forward to building on this decision at the current session of the General Assembly.

The President: I thank the representative of Malaysia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Ireland. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Hayes (Ireland): First of all, Madam President, I would like to congratulate you on your assumption of the office of President of the Council for the month of November. We look forward with anticipation to your leadership of the Council during this month.

I would also like to thank your predecessor, Ambassador Hannay, for his effective performance of the duties of the office during the month of October.

My delegation is pleased to have this opportunity to address the Council on the important issue of improved consultation procedures between troop-contributing countries, members of the Security Council and representatives of the Secretary-General.

As a troop contributor of long standing, Ireland has taken a keen interest in the recent efforts which have been made to improve the flow of communications and views between troop-contributing countries and members of the Council. We have supported this process as one which is desirable and even inevitable, given the rapid expansion in both the number and complexity of peace-keeping operations in recent years. Troop-contributing countries have a right to be consulted on - and, indeed, to be able to contribute to - the decision-making process on peace-keeping operations in which, through the provision of troops, they have a direct interest.

We have also supported improved consultation procedures in the context of efforts to achieve greater transparency in the operations of the Security Council. The dividend resulting from such increased transparency should be a higher level of political support generally

among Member States for the peace-keeping role and activities of the United Nations.

My delegation would like to thank the delegations of Argentina and New Zealand for the initiative they have undertaken to further develop consultation procedures between troop contributors and the Council. My delegation has already made clear to the members of the Security Council, through the letter which it forwarded to the President of the Council on 26 October 1994, why it believes that that initiative was a timely and welcome one. In particular, Ireland feels it is now opportune to put those improved consultation procedures which have evolved over the past 12 months or so on a more secure footing by moving away from meetings convened on an ad hoc and limited basis to a system of regular joint meetings of the Council and troop contributors, covering all current peace-keeping mandates.

We warmly welcome the fact that it has proved possible for the Council to reach agreement on a series of measures to improve the process of consultation and communication. The new measures represent a significant enhancement of the current consultation procedures and go a considerable way to meet the concerns and wishes expressed in recent months by many troop contributors and other non-members of the Security Council. We have no doubt that the new arrangements will contribute greatly to more effective implementation of Security Council mandates.

My delegation now looks forward to the rapid implementation of the measures outlined in the presidential statement. On the basis of the experience acquired in implementing them it will become clear in due course what further measures may be necessary in order to provide for a fully effective process of consultation and communication between troop contributors and the Council. In this regard, we particularly welcome the intention of the Council to keep consultation arrangements under review and to consider, on the basis of experience, whether further enhancements might be required in the future.

The President: I thank the representative of Ireland for the kind words he addressed to me.

I now ask for the indulgence of subsequent speakers. As agreed in the Council's prior consultations, I shall suspend the meeting briefly now in order to take up an urgent matter.

The meeting was suspended at 6.40 p.m. and resumed at 6.45 p.m.

The President: The next speaker is the representative of Belgium. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Portocarero (Belgium) *(interpretation from French):* Madam President, may I join those who have already congratulated you on your assumption of the presidency for this month. May I also thank the outgoing President of the Council. Our thanks also go to the delegations which took the initiative that has resulted in our being here today.

Belgium warmly welcomes the adoption by the Security Council of the presidential statement within the framework of "An Agenda for Peace", particularly with regard to the improvement of procedures guiding consultations between troop-contributing countries, members of the Security Council and the Secretary-General.

Without wishing in any way to infringe the competence and the prerogatives of the Council, Belgium firmly supports all efforts that will lead to greater regularity and transparency in those consultations. Indeed, these consultations will first of all allow troop-contributing countries to assist the Secretariat in the management of these operations. The improvements which the Council has just introduced will enable a real dialogue to begin between the contributors and the members of the Council with regard to the mandate and the basic conditions for peace-keeping operations. Indeed, the contributors often have a better knowledge of the situation on the ground and can therefore judge whether new tasks are acceptable and feasible. The security of the troops, which for Belgium is an absolute priority, cannot but benefit thereby.

Increased transparency in the work of the Council will make a positive contribution to increasing the support of opinion in the troop-contributing countries. This is an essential factor in ensuring continued participation by the troops in United Nations peace-keeping operations.

Finally, Belgium supports the Council's decision to continue to study, in the light of future experience, the possibilities for improving and further promoting these consultations.

The President: I thank the representative of Belgium for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Italy. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Fulci (Italy): Madam President, may I begin by joining previous speakers in congratulating you on your assumption of your new duties as President of the Security Council for the month of November. It is a tribute and a challenge to your considerable diplomatic skills. May I also thank Sir David Hannay for the exemplary way in which he presided over the Council during the month of October.

The presidential statement approved by the Security Council today with regard to regular consultations with troop-contributing countries represents a significant step in the direction long hoped for by my country as well as many other countries which contribute in varying degrees and forms to United Nations peace-keeping operations.

Therefore, my delegation wishes to thank you, Madam President, as well as the Permanent Representatives of Argentina and New Zealand, who began this welcome initiative and promptly reintroduced the question in the General Assembly. Italy would also like to express its thanks to the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom for his substantial contribution to the document.

In our opinion, we should focus on three needs: first, consultation with troop-contributing countries before the Council makes any decision; secondly, dual-representation by the Secretariat and the Council at the highest level; and, thirdly, a steady flow of information and regular announcements of meetings before they take place.

It is our view that this is an important step forward but still it does not represent the achievement of the final goal. For some time now my delegation has maintained that we need to define consultation procedures in a precise and binding fashion. Therefore, even though we do not wish to underestimate the importance of the presidential statement, we feel that a resolution would have been a more appropriate instrument.

Some parts of the text still leave room for misinterpretation. For example, how do we define a "significant change" in a mandate? That is also why my delegation continues to believe that consultation on the mandate's definition must take place at an early stage. Furthermore, consultations are now planned only for the extension or termination of a mandate. Clearly, there are still gaps to be filled.

Italy is convinced that a truly satisfactory consultation mechanism constitutes the most solid base on which to build an efficient and unified chain of command in United Nations peace-keeping and therefore to assure rational conduct of the operation. That said, we are sincerely appreciative of the crucial first step that has been made.

The President: I thank the representative of Italy for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Batu (Turkey): I join previous speakers to congratulate you, Madam President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. We are confident that under your able guidance the Council will successfully carry out its responsibilities. I would also like to pay tribute to Sir David Hannay of the United Kingdom, for the remarkable manner in which he conducted the work of the Council in October.

As a troop-contributing country, Turkey attaches particular significance to the need for a new consultative mechanism between troop-contributing countries and the members of the Security Council, and fully shares and supports the views of Argentina and New Zealand, which were very well reflected in the joint letter, S/1994/1063, dated 15 September 1994.

Under Article 25 of the Charter, Member States agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. The authority of Council decisions emanates from the fact that the Council, in accordance with Article 24 of the Charter, acts on behalf of all Members of the United Nations. The fact that Council decisions must have an adequate consensual base is also inherent in the letter and spirit of Article 1, paragraph 4 of the Charter, which describes "harmonizing the actions of nations" as one of the purposes of the United Nations. Therefore, the lack of a sufficient consultation mechanism undermines the legitimacy of Council decisions on peace-keeping operations. Almost two thirds of the troops serving in these operations are currently contributed by non-permanent members and non-members of the

Security Council. That is why we insist on being more fully consulted by the Security Council, without, of course, any prejudice to the exercise by the Council of its decision-making authority under the Charter. Accordingly, we believe that the process of improving consultation procedures should be further developed and institutionalized.

The democratization of Council procedures and transparency in the work of the Council would not only strengthen the moral ground for the implementation of its decisions, but also help to strengthen public support in our countries, such support being an essential factor in ensuring continued involvement by our troops in United Nations peace-keeping operations.

Although our preference was for the adoption of a comprehensive resolution on this important issue, we also welcome this presidential statement, as a historic first step, which emphasizes the need for further enhancement of the arrangements for consultation and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries and sets out the necessary procedures.

The President: I thank the representative of Turkey for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Australia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Butler (Australia): I suppose I would strain the pun slightly if I said it gave us a profound sense of security to see you, Madam President, sitting in the President's chair this month. May I also offer our congratulations to Sir David Hannay, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, on the job that he did last month.

Australia welcomes the statement which you, Madam President, made today on behalf of the Council on arrangements for consultation and exchange of information with troop-contributing countries.

We all know that in recent years there has been growing expressed concern about the need to improve the briefing procedures, working methods and practices of the Security Council. This concern has been reflected in the consistent calls for improved mechanisms for communication and consultation between the Security Council and the overall membership of the United Nations.

We have been pleased to see that there have been some improvements. We have seen positive examples of where the Security Council has listened to Member States and has sought to respond to calls for change.

As the report of the Security Council, which was considered in the General Assembly last week, records, some initial steps have been taken by the Council, particularly towards improving the accessibility and transparency of its deliberations. These constructive efforts should be seen, we believe, in the context of the unprecedented number of often complex situations to which the Council is being called upon to respond and the increasing frequency, indeed, virtually continuous nature of its deliberations.

While we have welcomed the steps the Council has taken, we have emphasized the importance we attach to continuing to address, as an ongoing process, improvements to the working methods of the Council. This has been particularly the case in relation to the arrangements for consultation and exchange of information between the Council, troop-contributing countries and the Secretariat.

As a troop-contributing country, Australia has, like many other Member States, a particular interest in the fullest possible consultation and exchange of information regarding United Nations peace-keeping operations. We therefore regard the procedures contained in the presidential statement as one important step which will enhance these arrangements for consultation and the flow of information.

We wish in particular to express our appreciation to New Zealand and Argentina for having taken this important initiative. The range of procedures which are outlined in the presidential statement will contribute to more effective and informed decision-making by the Council and provide for enhanced transparency and cooperation with all Member States in relation to the United Nations important responsibilities in peace-keeping.

But while these procedures represent a significant change, they are only a first step. We would like to have seen the Council decide to establish, under Article 29 of the Charter, a Council committee on consultations with troop-contributing countries, as New Zealand originally proposed.

We would also like to see the Council give full effect to Article 44 of the Charter so that troop-contributing countries can participate in decisions taken by the Council under Chapter VII. We also agree with others that there is a need to systematize the Council's practice of consulting countries with regional or other specific interests.

It is therefore important that in taking this first step the Security Council has agreed that the arrangements contained in the presidential statement are not to be considered exhaustive and that the Council stands ready to consider further measures.

We strongly urge the Council to continue in the direction on which it has now embarked. We will follow further developments with keen interest.

The President: I thank the representative of Australia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Madam President, on the assumption of the office of President of the Security Council for this month. My delegation is confident that the Council will successfully and expeditiously carry out its responsibilities as prescribed in the Charter under your able presidency.

I should also like to pay tribute to Sir David Hannay, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, for the skilful leadership he showed while presiding over the Council last month.

I should like first of all to state that my delegation warmly welcomes the newly established practice of holding informal briefings for States Members of the United Nations by the President of the Council. My delegation is hopeful that this new procedure will be further developed in order to contribute to greater transparency in the Security Council's work.

The statement adopted this morning concerning improvements in procedures for consultations among the Security Council, the Secretary-General, and the troop-contributing countries is welcomed by my delegation. We have no doubt that this is an important step. As a troop-contributing country, Egypt has long called for such procedures to be adopted by the Security Council. We are indeed indebted to the delegations of Argentina and New Zealand, which seized the initiative and presented their proposals to the Council. Egypt has joined many other delegations in supporting this important initiative.

In a letter dated 27 October 1994 (S/1994/1231), I informed the President of the Council that the Government of Egypt was joining other Governments in the call for increased and more institutionalized procedures for such consultations.

The letter also referred to the fact that at any given time now, the overwhelming majority of United Nations peace-keeping forces and observers came from States that were not members of the Council. These forces and observers are being mandated by the Security Council to perform their duties in a sometimes dangerous environment. Troop-contributing countries should, therefore, be consulted before decisions affecting the lives and safety of their nationals are adopted by the Council. The Council should, in our view, be guided in this respect by the spirit of article 44 of the Charter, which calls for inviting the Member States providing armed forces

> "to participate in the decisions of the Security Council concerning the employment of contingents of that Member's armed forces".

My delegation considers that such consultations would not infringe the authority of the Security Council; rather, they would contribute to and enhance the credibility of the Council. The Council, in our view, should also consider further developing the consultations process by establishing a subsidiary organ, as stipulated by Article 29 of the Charter, to ensure genuine transparency and more efficient functioning.

In carrying out its responsibilities under the Charter, the Security Council acts on behalf of all Members of the United Nations. My delegation therefore firmly believes that the significant step adopted today will be followed in due course by an expansion of the consultations process to encompass all the parties concerned. My delegation hopes that the consultation process will be undertaken in a timely, systematic and institutionalized manner.

My delegation is also looking forward to further action by the Council to strengthen the consultation procedures with troop-contributing countries concerning ongoing peace-keeping operations, as well as future operations.

Finally, my delegation notes with satisfaction that the Security Council will keep under review arrangements to improve the quality and speed of the flow of information available to support the Council's decision-making process.

The President: I thank the representative of Egypt for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Greece. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Zacharakis (Greece): At the outset, I should like to congratulate you, Madam President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I have no doubt that your professional experience and skills will be of invaluable assistance in conducting the affairs of the Council.

I should also like to congratulate His Excellency the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom on the highly efficient manner in which he conducted the work of the Council during the month of October.

I should like to join all the other speakers who emphasized the importance that they attach to improving procedures for the exchange of information and consultation between the Council, the Secretariat and countries involved in peace-keeping operations mandated by the Council. Without in any way wishing to infringe the authority of the Security Council, we firmly believe that intensified dialogue and stronger interaction among all those concerned will increase the efficiency of the efforts of our Organization in the area of peace-keeping.

Therefore, we are grateful to the Permanent Representatives of Argentina and New Zealand for their initiative, and we welcome today's presidential statement, which constitutes, in our view, a good working basis for the benefit of all of us.

I should like to refer in particular to the fact that, as pointed out in that statement, the arrangements described therein are not exhaustive, and that consultations may take a variety of forms, including the participation, as appropriate, of other countries especially affected, for example countries in the region concerned.

The case of the United Nations peace-keeping operation in the former Yugoslavia is very telling in this regard. Greece has not contributed troops to the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) because it wished to abide by the principle of non-participation in United Nations operations in neighbouring countries, or countries that have a special interest in the region. This certainly does not mean that we have not shouldered more than our share of the burden, as is proved by the considerable economic implications for my country of the implementation of the sanctions imposed against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), nor that we do not have a legitimate interest in being closely involved in the aforementioned consultations, to which we could make an important contribution.

My country is currently involved in United Nations peace-keeping efforts in Iraq, Georgia and Western Sahara. Recently, Greek peace-keepers have participated in the operations in Somalia and Cambodia. And finally, we have been repeatedly commended, together with the Government of Cyprus, for our substantial voluntary contribution towards the financing of the operational cost of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), whose role, as is so often stated by the Security Council and the Secretary-General, remains invaluable with regard to efforts aimed at achieving a just and viable solution to the problem. We look forward to participating constructively in the arrangements for consultation and exchange of information set out in the presidential statement before us.

The President: I thank the representative of Greece for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Ukraine. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine): Let me congratulate you, Madam President, upon your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of November. The delegation of Ukraine is confident that your experience and outstanding diplomatic skills will help you to find effective solutions to the problems the Security Council is now facing. Let me also convey, through you, our appreciation to your predecessor, Sir David Hannay, for his excellent work done in October.

This meeting of the Security Council is long overdue. The scope and scale of United Nations peace-keeping operations, their successes and failures, experience and shortcomings clearly called for scrupulous and thorough investigation on the part of the Security Council. At the same time it has become obvious that troop-contributing countries non-members of the Council

should get the right to voice their preoccupations and objections, if any.

In Ukraine, we came across a situation when the field commanders of the Ukrainian contingent submitted reasonable practical proposals as how to make their important mission more effective — for example, how to enhance protection of personnel and minimize the risk of fatalities. But the mechanism of consultations between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the troop-contributing countries is far from effective.

The field experience of our troops in the territory of the former Yugoslavia has explicitly proved the necessity of a solid legal basis for the protection of United Nations and related personnel. It is with great sorrow that I inform the Council of a new loss in our battalion at Sarajevo, which occurred very recently.

In this connection, we hope that the draft convention that will be submitted next week to the Sixth Committee will enjoy unanimous support and be adopted by consensus at this session of the General Assembly.

We would also like to commend the efforts of the delegations of New Zealand and Argentina and more personally those countries' Ambassadors for their contributions to this exercise. Their joint proposals reflect the common ideas and preoccupations which exist among the troop-contributing countries.

In our view the proposal to convene informal discussions involving the members of the Council and all troop-contributing countries every second week of the month should be supported. These meetings might be used not only to discuss events in the field but also to share the experience of every troop-contributing State in order to improve the efficiency of the operation.

As far as the proposal to convene specific and ad hoc meetings is concerned, the delegation of Ukraine would also like to see among their participants the representatives of the regional organizations that are engaged in support of peace-keeping operations, for example, in the case of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO).

Another important issue which we suggest the Security Council and troop-contributing States think about together is the procedures of the formation of a United Nations force. The delegation of Ukraine views it as essential that this should also discussed between the members of the Council and potential troop-contributing countries in order to avoid possible misunderstandings between the Secretariat, the Security Council and States.

We hope that the procedures which we are discussing today will prove their effectiveness in the very nearest future.

The President: I thank the representative of Ukraine for his kind words addressed to me.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 7.15 p.m.